



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,439	03/09/2004	Gary Weller	SATTY 69244	4484

7590 07/08/2010
JOHN S. NAGY, ESQ.
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6060 CENTER DRIVE, 10TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

ERIZO, DARWIN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3773

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/08/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/797,439

Applicant(s)

WELLER ET AL.

Examiner

Darwin P. Erez

Art Unit

3773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-60 and 100-117 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 53-60 and 100-117 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the applicant's Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed on 2/9/10, in which a decision to reopen the prosecution was mailed on 4/28/10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 44-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,478,791 to Carter et al. in view of US 6,592,596 to Geitz, and in further view of US 5,250,075 to Badie.

Carter discloses a method of acquiring tissue comprising: positioning a first and second acquisition members **52** adjacent to a region of tissue, wherein the first and second acquisition members are in apposition to one another along a first longitudinal axis in an open configuration (Fig. 9A); adhering tissue with the first and second acquisition members by compressing the tissues between the first and second acquisition members in a closed configuration (Fig. 9B); fastening the tissue between the first and second acquisition members with at least one fastener **24**; removing the first and second acquisition members from the region of tissue (after surgery); reconfiguring the first and second acquisition members from a closed configuration to an open configuration prior to positioning (Fig. 9A); wherein positioning the first acquisition member and the second acquisition member comprises aligning the members adjacent to a lesser curvature (closing the acquisition members); wherein adhering tissue could be is done simultaneously by the first and second acquisition members.

Carter is silent with regards to the method of folding tissues from within a hollow body organ by advancing the first and second acquisition members transesophageally into the hollow body organ (during surgery); wherein adhering tissue comprises drawing

tissue into each of the first and second acquisition members via a vacuum force; and adhering tissue sequentially.

However, the use of a device for creating a fold from within a hollow body organ is well known in the art. For example, Geitz discloses a device that is advanced transesophageally into the stomach area (hollow body organ). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the device of Carter to create a fold from within a hollow body organ since the use of such devices is well known in the art, as taught by Geitz, and since it has been held that use of a known technique (creating fold within a hollow body organ) to improve similar devices (fold creating devices) will yield predictable results. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1742, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007).

With regards to the step of adhering tissues by drawing the tissues using a vacuum force, Badie discloses that it is well known in the art to provide a suction port to an acquisition member (such as a leg). Badie provides the suction port for providing irrigation means to the distal end of the device, but the suction would also allow tissue to be adhered to the acquisition members. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Carter to have a suction force adhering means as it would better secure the tissues within the tissue acquiring members prior to closing said members, and it would also allow means for irrigating the surgical site.

With regards to the step of adhering the tissues sequentially, it is noted that such step would be a mere obvious design choice since the applicant has not disclosed that

said step provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with either the acquiring tissues simultaneously or the claimed acquiring the tissues sequentially because both steps perform the same function of acquiring tissues.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 44-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Darwin P. Erez who whose telephone number is (571)272-4695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Darwin P. Erezol/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773